R E M A R K S

Request for Reconsideration, Informal Matters, Claims Pending

The non-final Office action mailed on 8 March 2007 has been considered carefully. Reconsideration of the claimed invention in view of the amendments above and the discussion below is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19, 24 and 26 have been canceled.

Claims 20-23, 25 and 27-37 are pending.

Arguments re: Khayrallah

Rejection Summary

Claims 10, 13-14 and 17-21 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0200499 (Khayrallah).

Discussion of Claim 20

Claim 20 was previously amended to include limitations of Claim 24. Khayrallah fails to disclose a

> ... method in wireless communications device, the method comprising:
> receiving a message identifying a channel on which content will be transmitted;
> receiving first layer content information on a first channel;
> receiving second layer content information on a second channel,

at least one of the first and second channels identified in the message,

the first and second layer content information is encrypted,

decrypting the first layer content information with a first key,

decrypting the second layer content information with a second key that is different than the first key.

The Examiner's assertion that the first and second layer content information is encrypted with different encryption keys is erroneous. At paragraphs [0028 & 0029], Khayrallah discusses error correction coding (FEC) data segments (K_1, K_2, K_3) transmitted on different channels (1, 2, 3). Error correction coding however is not the same as encryption. Error correction coding is used to maintain the integrity of data transmitted over a noisy channel. FEC works by transmitting redundant information. At paragraph [0022], Khayrallah indicates that the FEC enables a receiver to reconstruct original information when less than all of the encoded symbols are received. In contrast, encryption is a process of transforming information so that it is undecipherable without a decryption key. Thus the first and second layer content information in Khayrallah is not encrypted. Moreover the information on the different channels of Khayrallah do not require separate keys to decrypt. Amended Claim 20 is thus patentably distinguished over the art.

Arguments re: Trossin & Hsu

Rejection Summary

In the Office action of 3 June 2006, Claims 8, 10-11, 13-14, 17-19 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

Publication No. 2003/0157899 (Trossin) in view of US Publication No. 2002/0141391 (Hsu).

Discussion of Claim 27

New Claim 27 corresponds to a combination of original Claims 1 and 11 excluding the limitations drawn to decoding and use of at least one of the first and second layers without the other of the first and second layers, which have been relegated to new Claim 35.

Regarding Claim 27, Trossin and Hsu fail to disclose or suggest a

> ... method in wireless communications network infrastructure entity, the method comprising:
> transmitting first layer broadcast/multicast service content information on a first channel;
> transmitting second layer broadcast/multicast service content information on a second channel,
> the first and second channels are downlink channels, at least one of the first and second channels is a shared broadcast channel,
> the first layer broadcast/multicast service content information related to the second layer broadcast/multicast service content information;
> encrypting the first and second layer broadcast/multicast service content information using different encryption keys before transmitting.

In the Office action of 3 June 20006, the Examiner alleged that Claim 11 (on which new Claim 27 above is based) would have been obvious in with reference to Hsu at paragraph 0061. Hsu however merely discusses encryption generally without disclosing or suggesting encrypting the first and second layer broadcast/multicast service content information, transmitted in

corresponding different channels, using different encryption keys before transmitting. Claim 27 is thus patentably distinguished over Trossin and Hsu.

Discussion of Claims 28-35

New Claims 28-34 correspond to original Claims 3-9. New Claim 35 corresponds to limitations recited in original Claim 1.

Discussion of Claim 36

New Claim 36 corresponds to original Claims 26 further amended to recite decrypting the first layer content information with a first key and decrypting the second layer content information with a second key that is different than the first key. The limitation drawn to integrating the first and second layer content information at the wireless communications device in original Claim 26 has been relegated to new Claim 37.

Regarding Claim 36, Trossin and Hsu fail to disclose or suggest a

> ... method in broadcast/multicast subscriber device, the method comprising:
> receiving first layer content information on a first channel;
> receiving second layer content information on a second channel,
> at least one of the first and second channels a shared broadcast channel,
> decrypting the first layer content information with a first key and decrypting the second layer content information with a second key that is different than the first key.

In the Office action of 3 June 20006, the Examiner alleged that Claim 26 (on which new Claim 36 is based) would was anticipated by Trossin.

New Claim 36 was amended however to recite decrypting the first layer content information with a first key and decrypting the second layer content information with a second key that is different than the first key, which the Examiner conceded Torssin does not disclose. As discussed above, at paragraph 0061, Hsu merely discusses encryption generally without disclosing or suggesting "… decrypting the first layer content information with a first key and decrypting the second layer content information with a second key that is different than the first key." Claim 36 is thus patentably distinguished over Trossin and Hsu.

Prayer For Relief

In view of any amendments and the discussion above, the Claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Kindly withdraw any rejections and objections and allow this application to issue as a United States Patent without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,

/ ROLAND K. BOWLER II /

_____

ROLAND K. BOWLER II   1 AUG. 2007

MOTOROLA, INC.   REG. NO. 33,477
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. (RKB)
600 NORTH U.S. HIGHWAY 45, W4-37Q   TELEPHONE NO. (847) 523-3978
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048   FACSIMILE NO.   (847) 523-2350